

The Universalist.

Vol. 4. THE STAR IN THE WEST.
Vol. LX. No. 13.

CHICAGO AND CINCINNATI, SATURDAY, MARCH 26, 1887.

THE NEW COVENANT.
Vol. XL. No. 13. No. 13.

The Universalist.

A RELIGIOUS AND FAMILY WEEKLY.

Universalist Publishing House,
PUBLISHERS.

CHARLES CAVERLY, GENERAL AGENT.

Issued by Western Branch.

69 Dearborn St., Rooms 40 and 41,
CHICAGO, ILL.

LORD & THOMAS, MANAGERS ADVERTISING DEPARTMENT.

Terms:

Postage Paid, \$2.50 A Year, in Advance.
Sample Copies Free.

WESTERN ADVISORY BOARD:

WM. H. RYDER, D. D., HON. JOHN R. BUCHER,
O. A. PRAY, REV. W. S. CROWE,
CHAS. L. HUTCHINSON.

Entered at the Postoffice as Second-Class Mail Matter.

Special Contributors.

RETRIBUTION.

By HATTIE TYNG GRISWOLD.
(Columbus, Wis.)

In that most powerful novel of Count Tolstoi, Anna Karenina, we have an appalling picture of that retribution, which has been the theme of so many of the great masterpieces of literature. From the earliest times, poets and dramatists and novelists have found this a fruitful subject, and have dealt with it with varying degrees of passion and of power. In modern times few stronger delineations of the inevitable retribution which follows sin have been made, than this of the great Russian novelist. The motto of the book, "Vengeance is Mine, I will Repay" gives the whole motive of the powerful book.

The story is one of thrilling interest, and the genius of the author is shown most strongly in the manner in which the retribution is brought about. Not from the outside—as it would have been by a less strong and original writer—but from within, the sin punishes itself, as is the method of nature, or of God, as you choose to phrase it. It is a story of an adulterous amour, and the end is a tragedy, as the end of such liaisons is apt to be, if the parties as in this case are persons capable of a sincere, profound and solemn passion. The heroine Anna Karenina, loves Tronky, for whom she has left her husband, an ambitious and absorbed, perhaps, also an unlovable man,—with a perfect passion. For him she has sacrificed even her son, whom she loved with all the intensity of her nature; her reputation, which was almost equally dear, for she was a proud, as well as a passionate woman,—and at first she feels satisfied with her sacrifices, and lives in a feverish dream of joy. Her lover takes her to his estates, where his high position insures her a certain respect, as he installs her as mistress of his splendid domain, as though she were his legitimate wife. His family treat her with consideration, and outwardly she is not subjected to those humiliations which in real life, and in most works of fiction, attend such a connection. She refuses the divorce which her husband offers her, preferring that the bond which binds her to Tronky shall be one of mutual love only, and she maintains this exaltation of feeling for a considerable time. She has now a daughter whom she does not love, all her motherly affection being centered in the son she has deserted, and whom she mourns with unavailing sorrow.

Soon the true punishment of guilty love sets in. "All the illusion which exalted the senses, as long as they are pastured in love's shadow" as one of Shakespeare's characters calls it, vanishes as soon as one is sated of love itself. Her life seemed a hot feverish dream, unreal and terrible, though filled with a kind of joy in the sweetness of her love, and her certainty of its being fully reciprocated by her lover. But the feeling of moral decadence which was within her made the dream almost hideous at times, even in the earlier days. She felt, we are told, "the impossibility of expressing the shame, the horror, the joy, that were now her portion. Rather than put her feelings into idle and fleeting words, she preferred to keep silent. As time went on, words fit to express the complexity of her sensations still failed to come to her, and even her thoughts were incapable of translating the impressions of her heart. She hoped that calmness and peace would come to her, but they held aloof. Whenever she thought of the past, and thought of the future, and thought of her own fate, she was seized with fear, and tried to drive these thoughts away." With a relentless hand Tolstoi, describes all the torments of her lot.

This is the keen and bitter interest of the book, the agonies of a soul making expiation for a grievous wrong. "What agonies of remorse," says another, "this illegal union so passionately desired brings upon the guilty woman! What deep mortifications and what

vulgar discomfitures; what deadly humiliations, and what prosaic irksomeness spring from this false situation, and ultimately make it so odious, so painful, that way of escape has to be found by an act of madness in a moment of despair." The punishment all comes from within as we said before. Outwardly all goes well, but she gnaws her own heart. She is constantly wondering what her lover's attitude is now toward her—whether he regrets his action, whether he loves her as much as before she yielded to him; and she sees in each attempted return to any occupation, to any distinction whatever, a proof of weariness, a confession of irksomeness, a sign of regret. It is easy to imagine the outcome.

These very fears and doubts worry Tronky, who is noble and high-minded, and single in his devotion to her, and the estrangement has begun. "These two beings, starting on the bright and free pinnacles of love, have descended, without being themselves aware of it, into the dark and suffocating regions of hate."

The terrible end of the beautiful woman is pictured with the same ruthless fidelity with which the whole story is told. She sees when in the midst of her agonies one day "a freight train coming; she goes to meet it. She looked under the cars, at the chains and the brake, and the high iron wheels; and she tried to estimate with her eye the distance between the fore and back wheels, and the moment when the middle would be in front of her. Then she said, looking at the shadow of the car thrown upon the black coal dust which covered the sleepers, there in the center he will be punished, and I shall be delivered from it all—and from myself." The full description is almost too terrible to read, and, indeed, the whole story is pitiless in its realism and in the unflinching manner in which this expiation is brought about, and fully carried out. No stroke of the brush has been omitted that would deepen the shadows, or add intensity to the tragedy. Tolstoi, the artist, is also Tolstoi, the moralist, in every line of this marvelous book.

Although this story is Russian, and preeminently a national book, yet the elements that go to make up this great social tragedy are universal, and the action might have taken place in any part of the world. And its doctrine of retribution for sin, is of world-wide application, and needs as much to be heeded here and now, as in the far-off land, in the time of which he writes. To the men and women who make up our own social circles, and to all ranks and conditions of life, the old subtle temptation comes, in one guise or another, and it must be met and faced here, sometimes by high and noble natures, like those of Anna Karenina and Tronky—as it must, if yielded to, be expiated, here as there, in some tragic fashion. Who has ever known good to come of such unlawful love? Who has ever seen a successful career founded upon a wrong? Who has ever studied the subject of these crimes against the family, and to find Tolstoi's matter verified, and to be solemnly impressed with the truth, that such vengeance is not only sure, but swift?

THE TRUE LESSON OF PROTESTANTISM.

Unity of belief is no longer either possible or desirable. Once we know unity of belief was held to be of such supreme importance that the faintest whisper of dissent must be punished with torture and death. This feeling of corporate responsibility must have grown in strength through many ages by natural selection, as those tribes in which it was most effectively developed, must have exterminated or enslaved their neighbors. It was the mainstay and support of priesthoods. Having so long been favored by natural selection, the feeling of corporate responsibility for conduct and opinion became so deeply grounded in men's minds that it long survived the stage of social development in which it had its origin. Most terrible and conspicuous of the consequences of this deep-rooted feeling has been that fanatical craving for the unity of belief in religious matters which has been the source of some of the worst evils that afflicted mankind. There has come, in complex modern societies, the gradual substitution of the idea of individual responsibility for that of corporate responsibility. The disintegration of orthodoxies which characterizes the present age is simply the further development of the same protest in behalf of individual responsibility for opinion. Instead of condemning variety of belief on such subjects, we should rather welcome each fresh suggestion as possibly containing some adumbration of truth hitherto overlooked. Religious belief in no way concerns society, but concerns only the individual; these matters lie solely between himself and his God. The craving for finality is itself, in its various degrees, an instinct of the uneducated man, of the child, the savage, and perhaps the brute.—John Fiske.

CONTRADICTIONS IN THE BIBLE.

A SYMPOSIUM.

Rev. J. B. Saxe's Recent Article Criticized by Two Contributors and His Reply to the Same.

Rev. R. B. Marsh.

I am surprised at some of the assertions made in the article by Rev. J. B. Saxe. It seems to me a strange and false use of language to say, "From its beginning, in the earliest ages of human history, to its close, only eighteen hundred years ago, no real contradiction can be pointed out." It seems to me that the New Testament really contradicts the Old in many places; sometimes by direct and plain statement, such as this: "Ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thy enemy; but I say unto ye, love your enemies," etc. In reference to the character of God, the Old Testament represents him as uncertain of the future, grieved, jealous, angry, hating, taking vengeance, seeking his own glory, repenting and changing his purpose, deterred from his purpose; again we find him represented as omniscient, unchangeable, as love, full of compassion, unvengeful. We find in one place that he hates one and loves another; again, he is no respecter of persons; loving every creature that he has made. In one place we find Moses saying, "I have seen God face to face"; and St. John saying, "No man hath seen God at any time." How will the 100th Psalm compare with the Sermon on the Mount? How will the Old Testament directions for the disposal of meat that dies of itself compare with Christ's direction to do unto others as we would have them do unto us? If these things, and scores more, are not contradictions, what does the word mean? It is a losing game to claim such perfection, and it has done and is doing more to make infidels than all the agnostic lecturers and writers in the world. Let us be reasonable; make no claims for the Bible that can be so easily proved to be false, and all will love it for the real truth and beauty it possesses. Its injudicious friends have done more to injure it than all its enemies can do. If we attempt to explain away all its contradictions, we shall so misuse language and distort the meaning of words that the direct confession will result.

Kent, O.

II.

S. Fillmore Bennett, M. D.

I have been much interested in the article entitled "Contradictions in the Bible," written for THE UNIVERSALIST of March 5, by Rev. J. B. Saxe; but I am impressed with the thought that Mr. Saxe brings up very little argument to shake the faith, (or want of faith), of one honestly believing the Bible contradictory, in its statements, and also honestly seeking the truth.

If one of the evangelists says that "Judas hanged himself, and came to his death in that way," and another says that he "fell down, burst asunder and his bowels gushed out, and he died in that way," as Dr. Lyman Beecher's "skeptic" claimed, would the quibble of Dr. Beecher, "Oh, I suppose the rope broke," satisfy any honestly doubting mind? Nay, such "contradictions" must be met with some more reasonable answer. Would Mr. Saxe dispose of it in such a cavalier manner? Indeed, how will he dispose of it?

If the Bible is inspired, it is inspired all through. It is fatal to its authority as the Word of God, if it does contain plain contradictions of statement. Nay, if it have one such, it much invalidates the authority of the whole. Such "contradictions," as above cited, must be explained by something more than a quibble and every honest skeptic will feel like calling on Mr. Saxe for his explanation.

Again: Is it not a fact that the "days" of creation, in the original language of the Scripture, mean the same periods of twenty-four hours which we now designate the same? I once asked a divine, learned in the original tongue, this same question, and his answer was in the affirmative. "By no latitude of interpretation," said he, "can they be taken to mean anything else; and I am forced to the conclusion that the writer intended that they should be understood that way, and no other. The interpretation of indefinite and immense periods of time for these 'days' was a necessity which modern science has forced upon us." It is some years ago since this answer was given me, and I may not quote it verbatim, but it impressed me so deeply at the time that I cannot misquote the speaker's meaning. If the statement is true, what right have we to assume that the writer meant anything else, or intended we should understand anything else than that the whole stupendous work of creation was performed in six days of twenty-four hours each? Will Mr. Saxe answer?

Mr. Saxe says: "In fact, considering when and how the Bible was written, and all the circumstances concerning it, the wonderful harmony and consistency in all its parts, and absence of contradictions, either of known facts or truths, or of itself, is one of the marvels of the world, and the strongest proof that it was inspired. The Koran was written by one man—and yet so contradictory was it with itself, * * * that its author had repeatedly to expurgate it, or expressly assume what he had previously written, in a subsequent alleged revelation."

Now, if the Bible is inspired, should the fact make any difference that it "was written" by many hands, in various parts of the world, and during a long succession of ages? Could not, and would not God, infallible and unchangeable, "inspire" many men, and in successive ages, just as correctly as one man in one age?

Should we not look for a book "inspired by God," to be perfect, no matter how many persons were the writers? As to expurgations and alterations, is not the Bible as open to the suspicion of such handling as the Koran or any other book? Skeptics say that the Nicene Council did tamper with the text for the very purpose of avoiding contradictions, as well as to make it agree in doctrine with the prior teachings of the Romish church. Is that claim true? If true, does it not rob the Bible of its sanctity as an inspired book, and degrade it to the level of other books written by uninspired men? Or were the men composing the Council of Nice inspired, so they might without sin alter an inspired book, and even

reject a considerable mass of writings which had hitherto been considered equally authentic with the part retained as sacred writings?

I ask these questions because I constantly hear them asked by persons who, I believe, have no desire to overthrow the authority of the Holy Scriptures, but who seek the real truth. Perhaps they have not been answered a thousand times, but from their frequent recurrence, by honest people, I suspect such answers, if made, are not readily acceptable to the general public. "Line upon line, and precept upon precept," are necessary to impress the truth upon men's minds. Is it, then, wrong to ask Mr. Saxe, or some other of our able correspondents to make these things clear?

"The true way, it seems to me," says Mr. Saxe, "to overcome skeptical objections of this kind, is to show the groundlessness of each charge when made." It seems to me, and therefore the suggestion above. I hope Mr. Saxe will pardon me, but I am of the opinion that such answers as he has made will not convince many skeptics.

Richmond, Ill.

III.

Rev. J. B. Saxe in Reply to the Above Articles.

My article seems to have attracted considerable attention. I will respond briefly to some of the criticisms upon it. Mr. Marsh thinks the New Testament contradicts the Old, and quotes Matt. v. 43. The reference is not to the Old Testament, but probably to some Rabbinical writings. No part of the Bible commands us to hate enemies, though such hatred was common, if not universal. If the Bible had not been inspired, it would almost certainly have contained such a command. He also thinks the character ascribed to God and to his love, omniscient, and so on. I suppose such objections were once regarded as having force. Galileo came near losing his life for teaching that the earth went round the sun, thus contradicting the Bible which declared the sun rose and set! We laugh at such opinions now. Every boy knows that the Bible speaks according to the appearance, just as we do in our ordinary speech. Suppose we should say, instead of the sun rose, the earth's axis turned into such a position as to permit the sun to be seen! That would be worse than anything ever told of a Boston girl! But this way of speaking according to the appearance, was much more common in the popular languages of the East, than with us. It was a common idiom. Everybody understood it. When God said to repent, he appeared to change the course of providential dealings; when angry to indict pain, or bring calamities. Our modern critics are not to assume that these old Bible writers were fools—especially they are not to predicate such assumptions on their own ignorance of the use of language in those days. It was a common use of language to say one had seen God, when he had seen a messenger of God, or any manifestation of divine power or glory. I could produce a hundred instances. To pretend that such a declaration contradicts St. John, would be as ridiculous as was the papal charge against Galileo!

The 109th psalm is simply a prayer, in the highly rhetorical and figurative language of the East, for justice upon great criminals; and Christ teaches the same doctrine. Because he also teaches something more, does not make him contradict David. I remember to have read a long list of similar "contradictions," prepared by Thomas Paine. I could easily drive a coach and six through every one of these objections.

We claim no "perfection" for the Bible. I, for one, do not believe in plenary inspiration. It contains a revelation; but much of it is simply history. It nowhere claims to be "inspired all through;" therefore it might contain one, or many contradictions without "invalidating the authority of the whole," as Mr. Bennett says. Why he regards Dr. Beecher's answer as a "quibble," or unsatisfactory, he does not say. The rope might have broken. It often occurs in modern times, when ropes are much better made than they were of old in the East. I have read of such instances in the newspapers within a few years. If it did, the two accounts are harmonious. This may not satisfy every "honestly doubting mind," but you can't charge "contradictions," when so simple, "reasonable," and probable a supposition will dispose of the difficulty.

That the Hebrew word rendered "day" in the account of creation, originally and literally meant a period of twenty-four hours, no one ever doubted; and the English word means precisely the same. "Therefore, in effect," says Mr. Bennett, "the work of creation was performed in exactly six days of twenty-four hours each." Such reasoning ought to make Aristotle turn in his grave! If you could only complete the syllogism! Major proposition: day literally means twenty-four hours. Minor: it is never used in an accommodated sense. Conclusion: therefore, as I did a month ago, "Such things were not done in your mother's day." I referred to some particular twenty-four hours of his lifetime of three-score and ten years! Common sense is a good thing to have about when reading any book. How many

English words have not acquired a secondary meaning? And this meaning often supersedes the literal one. How is the term day used in the Bible? See Gen. xix. 37, 38; xxvi. 33; xxxi. 40. Isa. xlii. 6; xli. 16, 18, 19, 21, 23. In all these instances, and I might quote an hundred more just like them, the word is in the same original that it is in the first chapter of Genesis; and in every instance it stands for an indefinite period of time.

A few years ago the *Index* (and that is a paper agnostic enough to satisfy any reasonable skeptic), contained an article which declared that there was such a remarkable agreement between the science of geology and the first chapter of Genesis, that the science, (as the theory of inspiration was inadmissible), must have been as well understood in ancient times as now! This reminds me of a story told of Horace Greeley. When any one told him a story that taxed his credulity too much, he would say, "Tell that to Mrs. Greeley. She will believe anything—except the Bible!" I have seen men with the same kind of a twist in their mental constitution. I only indicated the agreement between Genesis and geology in my article. I might show it at length, and in detail. Perhaps I will sometime.

If the "divine" mentioned really meant to say that the Hebrew word, rendered day, always stood for a period of twenty-four hours, he was, as I have shown, poor authority "in the original tongue." Of course we would expect an inspired book to be consistent with itself, and with truth, "no matter how many persons were the writers." The Bible is consistent. Therefore it is inspired. I said it was a "marvel," because inspiration is.

Mr. Bennett and the "skeptics" he mentions, seem to have opinions of their own about the relation of the Nicene council to the Bible. It is as important for skeptics to know what they are talking about, as for anybody. They ought, therefore, to know that the famous council of Nice was held in the year 325; and that more than two centuries before that date, the Bible had been translated into many languages, and manuscripts of all these versions had been multiplied all over the world. Many of these versions, and even some of the manuscripts, or immediate copies of them, still exist, and have been laboriously collated by learned men, to ascertain the true text. Moreover, the church had long been divided into hostile sects as it is to-day, each jealous of its peculiar opinions, and each watching the others, expressly to prevent him tampering with the text. It was as literally impossible for the Nicene council, or any other body of men, or any available human agency, to corrupt the Bible in the way supposed, as it would be for a sectarian convention to do it at the present day.

The assumption is utterly preposterous. The council had as much to do with shaping our Bible as the man in the moon. It is derived from sources much earlier than the date of this assemblage. That it attempted something of the kind may be true. As to rejecting apocryphal books, or retaining canonical ones, the opinion of the council goes for what it is worth, and no more. The talk so common among unbelievers of a certain calibre, about the absurdity of voting books into or out of the Bible, (I have heard it ever since I can remember), only causes a well informed man to smile at their simplicity. Every book in the Bible stands on its own footing and its canonical character is determined by evidence entirely independent of the vote of any council.

It is not to be supposed that a man will be impressed with the evidences of the inspiration of the Scripture, if he has never studied the subject—if the most he knows about the Bible is derived from Paine's "Age of Reason," or some similar book. It is well to read such books; but if he seeks the "real truth," let him also read such works as Horne's "Introduction," Dr. Geikie's "Hours With the Bible," or others like them. A brief newspaper article cannot contain what a ponderous quarto is not large enough to hold.

I have also received a communication on the subject, from Dr. McKay, of Seneca, Kansas. He thinks the Old Testament ought not to be regarded as a part of "our Christian Bible," because in the New, Christ is said to be the fulfillment of the "law and prophets." That would be the reason, or one of the reasons, I should give on the other side of the question. Of course, the Old is not to be taken as equal in importance, or in fullness of revelation, to the New. Take it for what it claims to be, or what the New claims for it; no more and no less. It was mainly designed for the use of the Hebrew people. It is an absurd use of it to make its commands to keep the seventh day, or to be circumcised, binding upon us.

He refers to the genealogy of Christ, as given by Matthew and Luke. They are entirely different—contradict each other, and unbelievers would say they were undoubtedly transcribed from the public registers, and anybody could verify or contradict them by consulting the

record. Why are they different? The most reasonable conjecture is, I think, that one is the genealogy of Joseph, and the other of Mary; and that Christ was begotten by ordinary generation, after the marriage of his parents. The passage or two that cannot be explained in harmony with this view, might have been interpolated in some of the early manuscripts during the Arian controversy, like 1 John v. 7. We cannot yet prove this, as we can in the case of the passage in 1 John, but it is not an unreasonable conjecture. I am by no means over confident of the truth of this hypothesis, and would like very much the opinion of some one better qualified to judge than I am. It would be absurd to claim that any man can solve all the difficulties in the Bible, any more than those in nature. There are apparent contradictions in science; we do not, therefore, reject science, but believe in it.

He also asks how we will reconcile the literal resurrection of Matthew, with the spiritual resurrection of Paul. I see no discrepancy. Christ's body was reanimated, as others had been, to convince such men as Thomas; and Paul gave an account of the *anastasis* into the future life. What finally became of Christ's body, I am not called upon to say, for I do not know. I suppose it went the way of other material bodies. There is certainly no contradiction.

Fort Scott, Kan.

EDWARDS AND CALVINISM.

The *Interior*, (Presbyterian), of Chicago, has made a bold discovery. It is that Jonathan Edwards was a poet; that he "was evidently a close student of Virgil and of Dante, and he excels both in the appalling realism of his materialistic descriptions." We fear that it is somewhat late in the day to convert Edwards into a poet, and to take the laurels from the brow of Virgil and Dante to crown the New England theologian. The unfortunate objection to such a theory is that furnished by the sermons of Edwards themselves. They are not allegories, but carefully constructed arguments. Their terror consists not alone in their lurid word pictures, but in the chain of argument and Scripture proofs by which these pictures are supported. Edwards was simply a man who tried to carry out Calvinism to its logical consequences. It was the consciousness that the natural sentiments of the human heart are opposed to such a terrible belief which made him seek to show, by elaborate argument, that in heaven such sentiments would be so modified that saints could rejoice in the damnation of their parents or their offspring. In the pulpit, Edwards held rigidly to the logic of his system; but the man was better than the God he worshipped, and in his journal could write these benign resolutions: "Resolved, never to do anything out of revenge," and "never to suffer the least motion of anger to irrational beings."

But the object of the *Interior* seems not to be so much to shield Edwards as to screen orthodoxy. It thinks it is "unfair to quote the materialism of Edwards as representing orthodoxy." If the *Interior* means that the orthodoxy of to-day is outgrowing such materialism, we agree with it. We said ourselves, in making some quotations from Edwards, that "the sublimated selfishness of these extracts would be repudiated by the majority of orthodox readers." They would shrink from his fearful imagery and his argument that the happiness of the saints is to be increased by the pain of the lost. We are rejoiced to believe that our orthodox friends have made some progress; but we should like to see them acknowledge it themselves, and get from it all the comfort to which they are entitled. And, then, we should like to see them give a little more credit to such men as Mayhew, Murray, and Ballou, who labored under much reproach and opposition to redeem the world from the bondage of views which orthodoxy is coming to repudiate.—*Christian Register*.

ALWAYS YOUR BEST.

A man's work is always of more importance to himself than to others. Whether it be teaching, literature, art, or some form of practical endeavor, he is more concerned than those who listen to his words, study his works, look upon his pictures. They may reject him, pass him, ignore him; but he can neither reject nor ignore himself. The minister who "preaches down" to his congregation, the artist who sacrifices his ideal for the sake of immediate popularity, the writer who trims his truth to catch the currents of passing interest—all these defraud others, but they defraud themselves still more. A man's work is a part of himself; it is a fruit of his living; it takes something from his life. Those about him may lose much if he gives something less than the best, but his own loss is always the greatest. A man's work is a part of the return he makes to God; if he chooses to pay God in inferior coin, he debases the circulation and others suffer, but the guilt is his alone.—*Christian Union*.

Editorial Briefs.

BY REV. I. M. ATWOOD, D. D.
Canton, N. Y.

All who are interested in the controversy over future probation, precipitated by the action of a Committee of the American Board, must be grateful to Prof. George P. Fisher, of Yale, for the calm and lucid discussion of the underlying facts and principles which he presents in the last *Independent*. In this matter, as in another to which Joseph Cook devoted unnecessary space a week ago, there are three classes among Congregationalists—believers, unbelievers and the perplexed. Dr. Fisher's paper, equally admirable in its reasoning and its temper, will bring relief to the last. They will see that it argues nothing against either the sanity or the orthodoxy of a man that he cannot allege a specific and authoritative text for his "speculation."

—Prof. Fisher is exactly right in saying that the various mitigations of iron-clad Calvinism have been made, not on the authority of any text, but in deference to the "prevailing spirit of the Gospel teaching." The significant fact about the whole controversy in relation to the future of the unsaved, is that, just in proportion as the Church becomes imbued with what Prof. Fisher calls "the spirit and drift of the Gospel," it acquires more hope for the heathen and the unregenerate. Hard dogmas relax under the influence of the very religion they were intended to serve. The logic of the Gospel is against the logic of orthodoxy.

—The force of Dr. Fisher's blow is felt in the editorial office and is attempted to be parried in the editorial columns. Six full columns are given up to the subject. We are gratified to observe that the *Independent* has recovered the courtesy which in former articles on this theme it had conspicuously laid aside. The subject is discussed with patience and gentleness. But, alas! what is gained in temper is lost in power. The strength of the editorial is in inverse ratio to its length. The *Independent* is usually direct, vigorous, incisive, whether right or wrong. It is in a bad way, surely, when it adds to the aim of being in the wrong the disgrace of being impotent.

—The *Evening Record*, a bright, new penny paper, of Boston, announces that it is about to introduce illustrations. We doubt if its readers will appreciate the improvement. In a paper as large as most of "the great dailies" are, illustrations are not an unmixed evil, because the space they occupy is so much subtracted from the too vast area of reading matter. But the space of a small sheet cannot be better used than in printing the news and in making sensible and sententious comments on it. But the fashion must be followed in journalism as elsewhere, we suppose.

—It is entirely legitimate for those who think Mr. Beecher's religious liberalism a dangerous thing, to mingle with their enlogism of his great powers more or less depreciation of his theology. But we submit that it is not handsome in them, nor is it logical, to intimate that any unusual laxity which he may (possibly) have exhibited is attributable to the latitude of his opinions. Fortunately it has been abundantly demonstrated that there is no causal connection between heresy and moral obliquity. The soundest orthodoxy is no safeguard against iniquity. On the other hand, all the world has learned that a Christian is not likely to be less pure and trustworthy for being liberal.

—George Ticknor Curtis, in imitation of another eminent lawyer, Judge Simon Greenleaf, has taken up by way of diversion from his professional labors, a branch of theological discussion. Prof. Greenleaf examined the testimony for the genuineness of the Gospels by the rules of evidence. His work, though lacking some of the features requisite to give it the character of an authority, is regarded as an original and valuable contribution to the subject. Mr. Curtis has been for many years a deeply interested student of the modern scientific theory of evolution. As time went on he began to feel within him a call to tell the public the results of his studies and reflections. Hence a volume entitled, "Creation or Evolution."

—Mr. Curtis explains in his preface under what persuasion he writes: "The result of my study of the hypothesis of evolution is, that it is an ingenious but delusive mode of accounting for the existence of either the body or the mind of man; and that it employs a kind of reasoning which no person of sound judgment would apply to anything that might affect his welfare, his happiness, his estate, or his conduct in the practical affairs of life." It is to the prejudice of the theory of evolution, certainly, that the reasoning by which it is supported appears so inconsequent to a mind trained to weigh evidence, and a mind, too, of the first order of ability.

—The question which the distinguished advocate sets himself to answer is one that discussion will not settle. It is a question of fact, but the fact cannot be ascertained. If it could the reasoning would be superfluous. No man knows what the fact in the case is. Mr. Curtis helps to make this point very plain. Those who have pretended to have original information are really as much in the dark as the rest of us. The remaining question is, What are the probabilities as to the fact? Mr. Curtis deals a heavy blow to the affirmative argument for the hypothesis of evolution. Opinions will vary as to the force of his own affirmative argument for the hypothesis of creation. But this book is strong, candid and interesting.